

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 4, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 6 recites the limitation of “the fluorescent lamp”, which lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 1, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,160,019 to Kawakami (hereinafter “Kawakami”). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0223020 to Lee (hereinafter “Lee”). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Japanese Patent No. 2001-338512 to Shiotani (hereinafter “Shiotani”). Claims 6, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0053008 to Nakano (hereinafter “Nakano”). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami and Lee in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0167626 to Matsuda (hereinafter “Matsuda”). Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of United States Patent No. 4,958,911 to Beiswenger (hereinafter “Beiswenger”). Claims 14 and 20 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Matsuda. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0053073 to Itoh (hereinafter "Itoh").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

With this response, claims 1, 2, 11 and 18 have been amended, and claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 19 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-13, 17 and 18 are currently pending in this application.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The rejection of claims 1, 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawakami is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In rejecting claims 1, 11 and 18, the Examiner acknowledges in the Office Action that Kawakami discloses in Figures 1-5 a liquid crystal display device, comprising: a liquid crystal display panel (element 200); a backlight unit (element 100) having a light guide plate (element 30), a fluorescent lamp (element 40), a reflection sheet (element 52) substantially enclosing an outer side of the fluorescent lamp except for a light exit portion to reflect light emitted from the fluorescent lamp (as shown), and a bottom cover (element 12) having an end portion (element 16) with a shape that substantially follows a contour of the reflection sheet to substantially surround and encase the reflection sheet and to support and affix the reflection sheet (as shown); at least one optical sheet (element 70) positioned along an upper surface of the light guide plate and overlapping an end portion of the reflection sheet (element 520c) by an overlap amount (B)

(as shown), wherein the end portion of the bottom cover (element 16) is positioned to leave a predetermined interval (A) from the light guide plate and the optical sheet to simplify assembly of the light guide plate and the end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps a portion of the light guide plate by the overlap amount (B) (as shown) and wherein the end portion of the bottom cover substantially contacts all the outer side of the reflection sheet except for a portion of the predetermined interval (A) and an overlapping portion with the overlap amount (B)(as shown); and a chassis (element 300) supporting and affixing the liquid crystal display panel and the backlight unit).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kawakami does not disclose at least, for example, “wherein the reflection sheet includes opposed first end portion and second end portion and wherein the second end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps the reflection plate and the light guide plate; and optical sheets positioned along an upper surface of the light guide plate and overlapping the first end portion of the reflection sheet by an overlap amount (B), wherein the end portion of the bottom cover is positioned to leave a predetermined interval (A) from end portions of the light guide plate and the optical sheets, and the first end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps the light guide plate by the overlap amount (B) and wherein the end portion of the bottom cover substantially contacts all the outer side of the reflection sheet except for a portion of the predetermined interval (A) and an overlapping portion with the overlap amount (B)” as recited in amended claim 1.

Because Kawakami does not teach each and every element of independent claim 1, Kawakami does not anticipate independent claim 1.

Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kawakami does not disclose at least, for example, “wherein the reflection sheet includes opposed first end portion and second end portion and wherein the second end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps the reflection plate and the light guide plate; and optical sheets over the light projection plane of the light guide plate and overlapping the first end portion of the reflection sheet by an overlap amount (B), wherein the end portion of the bottom cover is positioned to leave a predetermined interval (A) from end portions of the light guide plate and the optical sheets, and the first end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps the light guide plate by the overlap amount (B) and wherein the end portion of the bottom cover substantially contacts all the outer side of the reflection sheet except for a portion of the predetermined interval (A) and an overlapping portion with the overlap amount (B)” as recited in amended claim 11.

Because Kawakami does not teach each and every element of independent claim 11, Kawakami dose not anticipate independent claim 11.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Kawakami does not disclose at least, for example, “wherein the reflection sheet includes opposed first end portion and second end portion and wherein the second end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps the reflection plate and the light guide plate; and optical sheets positioned along an upper surface of the light guide plate and overlapping the first end portion of the reflection sheet by an overlap amount (B), wherein the end portion of the bottom cover is positioned to leave a predetermined interval (A) from end portions of the light guide plate and the optical sheets, and the first end portion of the reflection sheet overlaps the light guide plate by the overlap amount (B) and wherein the end portion of the bottom cover substantially contacts all the outer side of the reflection sheet except for a portion

of the predetermined interval (A) and an overlapping portion with the overlap amount (B)” as recited in amended claim 18.

Because Kawakami does not teach each and every element of independent claim 18, Kawakami does not anticipate independent claim 18.

Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Lee. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Shiotani. Claims 6, 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Nakano. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami and Lee in view of Matsuda. Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Beiswenger. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Matsuda. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Itoh.

Reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

As discussed above, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 1, and therefore, claims 2 and 4-7 are patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Moreover, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 11, and therefore, claims 12, 13 and 17 are patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 11.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /Xiaobin You/
Xiaobin You
Reg. No. 62,510

Dated: April 29, 2010

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000
Facsimile: 202-739-3001